

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-14 and 16-20 were examined by the Office, and in the final Office Action of June 25, 2008 all claims are rejected. With this response claim 1 is amended, and claim 14 is cancelled. All amendments are fully supported by the specification as originally filed. Applicant acknowledges that claim 1 is amended after a final rejection, but respectfully requests entry and consideration of the amendment to claim 1 for the following reasons.

Claim 1 is amended to recite “electrically combining said information from each of said at least two peripheral devices by means of a bus.” On page 4 of the Office Action, the Office states that claim 1 has no mention of a bus or specific structure that performs the electrical combining. The Office however notes that claims 11 and 13 do recite that a bus performs the electrical combination, and on page 11 of the Office Action claims 11 and 13 are indicated as allowable. Accordingly, claim 1 is amended to include limitations similar to those recited in allowable claims 11 and 13. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not amended to include limitations that are outside of the scope of the allowed independent claims. As such, applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to claim 1 do not require additional search or substantive examination on the part of the Office, and respectfully requests entry and consideration of the amendment to claim 1.

Claim Rejections Under § 102

In section 3, on page 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Pacheco (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2003/0212857). Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Pacheco, because Pacheco fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1. Claim 1 is amended to recite electrically combining said information from each of said at least two peripheral devices by means of a bus to produce combined information indicating a time which is required at the most by any of said at least two peripheral devices for its respective initialization. On page 11 of the Office Action, the Office states that Pacheco does not disclose that a bus combines the information indicative of a time required for an initialization of a respective one of at least two peripheral devices in order to produce combined information. Accordingly, claim 1 is amended to specifically recite that the information is electrically combined by means of a bus. Therefore,

in view of the amendment to claim 1, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by Pacheco.

The claims depending from independent claim 1 are also not disclosed or suggested by Pacheco at least in view of their dependencies.

Independent claim 14 is cancelled, and therefore the rejection of claim 14 is moot.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

In section 4, on page 7 of the Office Action, claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Pacheco in view of Crittenden (U.S. Patent No. 5,566,351). Claim 4 ultimately depends from claim 1, and therefore is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

In section 5, on page 8 of the Office Action, claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Pacheco in view of Masui (U.S. Patent No. 6,964,018). Claim 6 ultimately depends from claim 1, and therefore is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

In section 6, on page 9 of the Office Action, claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Pacheco in view of Masui and further in view of The MultiMediaCard System Specification Version 3.31 by the MMCA Technical Committee. Claims 7-10 ultimately depend from claim 1, and therefore are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

In section 7, on page 10 of the Office Action, claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Pacheco in view of Vander Kamp (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,625). Claim 16 ultimately depends from claim 1, and therefore is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references at least in view of its dependency.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges that claims 11, 13 and 17-20 are indicated to be allowable for the reasons mentioned on page 11 of the Office Action.

Conclusion

The rejections of the Office Action having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal thereof. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 23-0442 for any fee deficiencies required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8 August 2008

s/Keith R. Obert/
Keith R. Obert
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No: 004955